

CHAPTER 5 - CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION



Summary of Scoping

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) ensures that environmental information is available to citizens and public officials before decisions are made and before actions are taken. It also provides a regulatory avenue for private citizens and organizations to express their opinions which may influence the proposed action. Scoping meetings are held early in the planning and decision-making process to establish effective and open communication with the public.

Scoping is an open process designed to determine the breadth of issues to be addressed in the EIS. It is intended to obtain the views of the public; state, local, and tribal governments; and other federal agencies. By involving the public through the scoping process, the proponent develops a comprehensive list of issues, then identifies the significant issues for study, aids in the development of additional alternatives, and ensures that the draft EIS is balanced and thorough.

Scoping also assesses the level of public interest in the project and identifies the agencies, groups, and individuals likely to be most interested in the proposed project. Scoping can have a profound and positive effect on the issues to be examined within the EIS, the environmental analyses, and, ultimately, on the decision made.

The formal scoping period began with publication of the Notice of Intent to produce a Management Plan, which appeared in the Federal Register on July 31, 2000 (Volume 65, No.147, Pg. 46731). Written comments were accepted through August 31, 2000. Although the original intent was to supplement the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area (CSEEA) Draft Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (DMP/DEIS), it became clear that a “stand alone” Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument (CSNM) Resource Management Plan would better serve planning process and the public. There has been a lot of interest in this area since it’s unique character was identified in the Medford District Resource Management Plan (USDI 1995a) and numerous public meetings have been held to share information and solicit comments from the public (Appendix MM).

The scoping process invited public input through a letter, sent to adjacent landowners and interested parties, announcing the establishment of the Monument and detailing the planning process. In addition, the CSNM web page provided up to date information on the Monument and solicited public input. All relevant information received during the comment period for the CSEEA DMP/DEIS was incorporated in the planning process.

During the scoping period, 267 letters, cards and e-mails were received. Comments were received from 12 different States. A response from every state north and west of Nevada as well as New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania. An e-mail was received from Parma, Italy with a scoping comment. The majority of comments were from southwest Oregon particularly Ashland and Medford. Form letters or e-mails were submitted by many respondents (174) and three letters had petitions attached. During and after the scoping period, meetings were held with representatives of State and local governments as well as other federal agencies to discuss management of the Monument.

Issues ranging from ecological concerns, to land use, to government control emerged after all letters and comments were catalogue and analyzed. In addition, over one-thousand comments received during the comment period of the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area Draft Management Plan were analyzed. Those supporting the CSNM designation emphasized protection, preservation and restoration of ecological values. Others raised concerns about restrictions on access to public resources and increased federal government control over public and private lands.

Key Issues and Concerns

At the conclusion of the scoping period, the interdisciplinary team used the scoping comments, comments from the CSEEA Draft EIS, and the Presidential Proclamation to identify key issues and concerns. The key issues were identified and described in Chapter 1, and have been addressed throughout the Plan.

Planning Consistency

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), Title II, Section 202, provides guidance for the land use planning system of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to coordinate planning efforts with Native American Indian tribes, other Federal departments, and agencies of the state and local governments. In order to accomplish this directive, the Bureau of Land Management is directed to keep informed of state, local, and tribal plans; assure that consideration is given to such plans; and to assist in resolving inconsistencies between such plans and Federal planning. The section goes on to state in Subsection (c) (9) that *“Land use plans of the Secretary under this section shall be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent he finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act.”*

The provisions of this section of FLPMA are echoed in Section 1610.3 of the BLM Resource Management Planning regulations. In keeping with the provision of this section, state, local and tribal officials were made aware of the planning process through the previously described mailings and meetings. Planning team members also met with local government and maintained communications with tribal officials regarding then CSNM planning process.

According to Section 1610.4-7 of the Bureau of Land Management Resource Planning Regulations, the CSNM Draft Resource Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement is provided to the Governor, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and Native American Indian tribes for comment. The resulting comments will be addressed in the Proposed Management Plan. The formal 60-day consistency review by the Governor will occur after the Proposed Resource Management Plan is published, as outlined in 1610.3-2(e) of the BLM Planning Regulations.

BLM planning regulations require that resource management plans (RMPs) be consistent with officially-approved or adopted resource-related plans and the policies and procedures contained thereon, of other federal agencies, state and local governments, and Native American tribes, “so long as the guidance and RMPs are also consistent with the purposes, policies and programs of federal laws and regulations applicable to public lands...” (43 CFR 1610.3-2). Consistency is construed as the absence of conflict. Based on BLM’s knowledge of the plans of such other agencies, the DEIS has been compared to the following agencies’ plans, for consistency, and BLM has reached the conclusions stated.

Federal Agencies

The Cascade-Siskiyou National Monument was established in southwest Oregon with the southern border along the Oregon/California state line. Although the Monument stops at the state line, the natural resources and natural processes generally occur on a Watershed or Subwatershed basis. Several Subwatersheds of the Klamath River basin are common across the Oregon/California border with the headwaters starting in the Monument. Before the Monument designation, the Cascade Siskiyou Ecological Emphasis Area Draft Management Plan (USDI 2000g) recognized the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Area in California as an important part of the natural processes in the Slide

Creek, Scotch Creek and Camp Creek Subwatershed. The lower Jenny Creek Subwatershed in California was also recognized although not associated with the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Area. Although the Presidential Proclamation did not recognize the California federal lands along the state line as part of the CSNM, it is clear that the natural resources throughout the entire Subwatersheds should be managed consistently. In order to coordinate management across state line, a Memorandum of Understanding was established among the BLM's Medford District (Oregon), the BLM's Redding Field Office (California) and the California Department of Fish and Game in March of 2001.

This DEIS is believed to be consistent with the following plans of other federal agencies:

- The Record of Decision on the 1994 *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl*.
- The Record of Decision on the 2000 *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Amendment to the Survey and Management, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standard and Guidelines*.
- The Forest Service's forest wide land and resource management plans for the adjacent Rogue River (1990) and Klamath (1993) National Forest.
- The BLM's Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan/EIS (1994)
- Natural Resource Conservation Service watershed plans.
- The Endangered Species Act and the following Fish and Wildlife Service plans:
 - Pacific Bald Eagle Recovery Plan
 - Final Draft Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Plan
 - Fish and Wildlife Service determination of critical habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl
 - Peregrine Falcon Recovery Plan
- The Bonneville Power Administration's latest annual Transmission System Facilities Resource Program.
- The Northwest Power Planning Council, Columbia River Basin, Fish and Wildlife Program, and subordinate species-specific strategies.

State Government

The DEIS is believed to be consistent with the following plans, programs, and policies of the State of Oregon agencies:

- Department of Environmental Quality
 - Smoke Management Plan
 - Visibility Protection Plan and air quality policies
 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration requirements
- Water Resources Department river basin programs for the Rogue and Klamath Rivers
- Water Resources Commission rules and statutes
- Department of Agriculture
 - Weed control plans
 - State-listed endangered plant species

- Division of State Lands
 - Removal - Fill Law
 - Oregon Natural Heritage Program
- Parks and Recreation Department
 - Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
 - State Parks and Recreation System Plan
 - State Recreation Trails Plan
 - State Historic Preservation Program
 - State Scenic Waterways Program and related projects
- Department of Transportation, Highway Division
 - Oregon Highway Plan
- Economic Development Department, Regional Economic Development Strategies

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
State Planning Goal 5	Open spaces, scenic and historical areas, and natural resources.	All alternatives conform with this goal as priority is given to protection, maintenance, and restoration of the Monument landscape.
Oregon Statutory Wildlife Policy, Revised Statute 496.012	<p>Maintain all species of wildlife at optimum levels and prevent the serious depletion of any indigenous species.</p> <p>Develop and manage the lands and water of the state in a manner that will enhance the production and public enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>Develop and maintain public access to the lands and waters of the State and the wildlife resources thereon.</p> <p>Regulate wildlife populations and public enjoyment of wildlife in a manner that is compatible with primary uses of the lands and waters of the State and provide optimum public recreational benefits.</p>	<p>All alternatives meet the objectives of this statute. Alternatives C and D could have some short-term affects on population of species dependent on old-growth conifer forest but long-term these species would benefit from these alternatives.</p> <p>Public access would be limited the most in Alternative D and to lesser degrees in Alternatives C and B.</p> <p>The habitat management in all alternatives will be conducive to most wildlife populations. The northern portion of the Monument will benefit late-successional habitat dependent species and the southern portion will provide a diversity of habitat.</p>
Oregon Threatened and Endangered Species Act	Protect and conserve wildlife species that are determined to be threatened or endangered.	All State species found within the Monument are also federally listed under the Endangered Species Act. The protection of these species is common in all alternatives.
Oregon's Sensitive Species Rule	Help prevent species from qualifying for listing as threatened or endangered	Most species on Oregon's sensitive species list would be well protected under all alternatives.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Nongame wildlife	Plan to maintain populations of naturally occurring Oregon nongame wildlife at self-sustaining levels within natural geographic ranges in a manner which provides for optimum recreational, scientific and cultural benefits, and where possible, is consistent with primary uses of lands and waters of the State.	Most species on Oregon's nongame wildlife species would be well protected under all alternatives.
Big Game Population Management Objectives	Develop, restore and/or maintain big game (along with associated recreation, aesthetic and commercial opportunities and benefits) at the level identified as the planning target level by game management unit. This is accomplished through hunting season regulation and implementation of multiple-use management practices on public lands that tend to stabilize the cover-forage relationship in space and time, provide for wildlife emphasis in management of sensitive wintering areas, and offer habitat improvement opportunities.	The habitat for big game will be enhanced at differing degrees through the different alternatives as Alternative B would provide the least amount of enhancement opportunities and Alternative D would provide the most. A big game management area is established in this CSNM Plan along the southeastern and southern boundaries (Map 29). This area complements the habitat provided in California by the Horseshoe Ranch Wildlife Habitat Area.
Wild Fish Policy	Protect and enhance wild stocks	All alternatives prioritize the protection of aquatic habitat for wild fish stocks. The Monument Aquatic Conservation Strategy (Appendix BB) provides for optimum protection of aquatic habitat.
Coho, Steelhead and Trout Plans	Maintain and enhance production.	The maintenance and enhancement of aquatic habitat for these species is common in all alternatives. The Monument Aquatic Conservation Strategy (Appendix BB) provides for optimum protection of aquatic habitat.
Basin Fish Management Plans	Establish compatible objectives for management of all fish stocks in each basin. Present tasks for attaining objectives, described unacceptable management strategies, and set priorities on achievement.	The maintenance and enhancement of aquatic habitat for all fish stocks is common in all alternatives. The Monument Aquatic Conservation Strategy (Appendix BB) provides for optimum protection of aquatic habitat.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Oregon Forest Practices Act Rules	Establish minimum standards which encourage and enhance the growing and harvesting of trees while considering and protecting other environmental resources such as air, water, soil, and wildlife	This Plan establishes Best Management Practices (Appendix AA) and a Monument Aquatic Conservation Strategy (Appendix BB) that provide minimum standards for all management activities and is common to all alternatives. Alternative D is the only alternative that promotes harvesting of trees and this would only occur for stand maintenance or restoration. The other alternatives incorporate thinning of small trees for stand maintenance.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Forest Use.	Preserve the forest land base of Oregon. Stabilize the present commercial forest land base. Manage habitat based on sound research data and the recognition that forests are dynamic and most forest uses are compatible over time.	All alternative preserve the conifer forest land and minimizes the conversion of forest land to accommodate expansion of transportation, power, and communication facilities. None of the Monument land will be exchanged and all forest lands will be maintained in that capacity. All lands capable of sustaining coniferous forest would be managed toward providing late-successional and old-growth habitat in all alternatives.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Timber Growth and Harvest	Promote the maximum level of sustainable timber growth and harvest on all forest lands available for timber production, consistent with applicable laws and regulations and taking into consideration landowner objectives.	All lands capable of sustaining coniferous forest would be managed toward providing late-successional and old-growth habitat in all alternatives. The objectives for forest lands in the CSNM is not for timber product but to provide habitat for late-successional and old-growth dependant species.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Forestry Program for Oregon – Recreation, Fish and Wildlife, Grazing, and other Forest Uses	Encourage appropriate opportunities for other forest uses, such as fish and wildlife habitat, grazing, recreation and scenic values on all forest lands, consistent with landowner objectives. A full range of recreational opportunities is encouraged. Where needed to reduce harassment and/or overharvest of wildlife, road closure programs are supported. Integration of sound grazing management practices compatible with timber management goals and wildlife habitat goals is encouraged	All alternatives provide opportunities for other forest uses. The priority objectives for management of forest lands in the Monument is for wildlife habitat and fish habitat. Indirect uses for recreation, grazing and collection of special forest products (i.e., mushrooms) is provided in most alternatives except Alternative D. Road closures in forest land base will be minimal as a result of reciprocal rights-of-way agreements with other landowners adjacent to the Monument. Grazing will continue in the short-term and will be re-evaluated in the future.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Forest Protection	Devise and use environmentally sound and economically efficient strategies to protect Oregon's forest from wildfire, insect, disease, and other damaging agents. Use integrated pest management. Employ cost-effective fire management policies that emphasize planned ignition fires over natural ignition fires and that consider impacts to the State's forest fire protection program.	Under all alternatives, economically efficient protection strategies would be employed while minimizing the disturbance to the landscape particularly in the Soda Mountain Wilderness Study Area (WSA) and the Research Natural Areas. The use of integrated pest management strategies is incorporated to varying degrees in the alternatives with Alternative D employing the most aggressive strategy. Alternatives C and D propose an aggressive fuel reduction strategy along the ridgeline separating the WSA from the northern portion of the Monument. Alternative C and D propose decommissioning roads in the southern portion of the Monument that may restrict access for fire suppression. Natural fire ignitions and prescribed natural fire will not be incorporated in any of the alternatives in this Plan

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Statewide Planning Goals – Citizen Involvement	To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. Federal and other agencies shall coordinate their planning efforts with the affected government bodies and make use of existing local citizen involvement programs established by cities and counties.	BLM's land use planning process provides for public input at various stages. Public input was specifically requested in developing issues. Public input will continue to be utilized in development of the final RMP. Coordination with affected government agencies, including the ODF and ODF&W, has been ongoing and will continue. BLM has been working with Jackson County Commissioners to provide a linkage to their constituents.
Statewide Planning Goals – Land Use Planning	To establish a land use process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.	All Alternatives in CSNM DRMP/DEIS have been developed in accordance with the land use planning process authorized by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 which provides a policy framework for all decisions and actions. The process includes issue identification, inventories and evaluation of alternative choices.
Statewide Planning Goals – Agricultural Lands	To preserve and maintain existing commercial agricultural lands for farm, consistent with existing and future needs for agricultural products, forest, and open space.	None of the alternatives affect the use of lands for agricultural use.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Statewide Planning Goals – Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources	<p>To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.</p> <p>Programs shall be provided that will (1) insure open space; (2) protect scenic and historic areas and natural resources for future generations, and (3) promote healthy and visually attractive environments in harmony with the natural landscape character. The location, quality and quantity of the following resources shall be inventoried:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Land needed or desirable for open space; Mineral and aggregate resources; Energy sources; Fish and wildlife areas and habitats; Ecologically and scientifically significant natural area Outstanding scenic views and sites; Water areas, wetlands, watersheds, and ground water resources; Wilderness areas; Historic areas; Cultural areas; Potential and approved Oregon recreation trails; Potential and approved Federal wild and scenic waterways and state scenic waterways. <p>Where no conflicting uses for such resources have been identified, such resources shall be managed to preserve their original character. Where conflicting uses have been identified, the economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences of the conflicting uses shall be determined and programs developed to achieve the goal.</p>	<p>Natural, historic and visual resources were considered in the development of the alternatives.</p> <p>The CSNM has been withdrawn from any forms of entry for mineral or resources.</p> <p>All alternatives in the CSNM prioritize the protection and maintenance of fish and wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Two ecologically and scientific significant Research natural Areas were identified and management plans written (Appendices DD and EE) common to all alternatives.</p> <p>The entire Monument viewshed is managed as VRM Class I or II and is common to all alternatives.</p> <p>Watersheds, wetlands, and streams were identified and many have been inventoried for proper functioning condition.</p> <p>The Soda Mountain Wilderness Study Area is identified in the Monument.</p> <p>Historic trails and significant cultural areas and sites have been identified and many have been inventoried.</p> <p>The Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail traverses the western border of the CSNM.</p> <p>There is no wild and scenic waterways identified in the CSNM.</p> <p>There are few conflicts in the Monument between preserving the resources or objects and uses in any of the alternatives. Access throughout the Monument is one of the only identified conflicts with priority in management toward limited access and more resource protection.</p>

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Statewide Planning Goals – Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality	To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.	The Federal and state water quality standards would be met and water quality would be maintained and/or improved under all alternatives. See Chapter 4, Effects on water resources. Burning of vegetation slash under all alternatives would have a slight temporary effect on air quality at the upper atmospheric levels. All alternatives would comply with the statewide Smoke Management Plan and the State Implementation Plan. See Chapter 4, Effects on Air quality for discussion.
Statewide Planning Goals – Areas subject to Natural Disaster and hazards	To protect life and property from natural disaster and hazards.	Natural hazard areas, particularly floodplains, and areas with highly erosive soils have been identified. All alternatives provide for appropriate management of natural hazard areas. Bureau authorized development within natural areas would be minimal under all alternatives, with project construction engineering reflecting site-specific conditions and requirements.
Statewide Planning Goals – Recreational Needs	To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities, including destination resorts. Federal agency recreation plans shall be coordinated with local and regional recreational needs and plans.	BLM actively coordinates its outdoor recreation and land use planning efforts with those of other agencies to establish integrated management objectives on a regional basis. Under all alternatives, opportunities would be provided to meet recreation demand providing they are consistent with protecting key Monument objects, resources or processes. None of the alternative would meet the demand for off highway vehicle use. The Hyatt Lake Recreational complex provides an array of recreational opportunities.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Statewide Planning Goals – Economy of the State	To diversify and improve the economy of the state.	None of the alternatives would contribute greatly to the economic stability of the region. Alternatives C and D would provide the highest potential for employment as many acres of vegetation manipulation, slash burning and road de-building would supply many job opportunities. Alternative B would provide limited economic opportunity as little intervention is prescribed.
Statewide Planning Goals – Public Facilities and Services	To plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development	Alternative D provides for the construction of a public facility for a visitor center. No other accommodations toward providing public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development are proposed.
Statewide Planning Goals – Transportation	To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economical transportation system.	All alternatives provide for accommodation of transportation needs for access across the Monument. In alternative B, C, and D roads in the southern portion of the Monument would be closed and some decommissioned to enhance resource protection. Decommissioning the roads would limit vehicle access to some of the Monument but does not inhibit valid existing rights.
Statewide Planning Goals – Energy Conservation	To conserve energy.	Conservation and efficient use of energy sources are objectives in all BLM activities. In alternatives C and D, firewood is made available but in limited amounts.

Local Government

The Oregon statewide planning program attached substantial importance to the coordination of federal plans with acknowledged local comprehensive plans. To the extent that BLM actions and programs are consistent with acknowledged county and city comprehensive plans and land use regulations, they can also be considered consistent with statewide planning goals. Local plans do not, however, address protection of Goal 5 values from the effects of forest management, as state law prohibits local government from regulating forest practices.

DEIS Distribution List and Availability on the Internet

This Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is being made available to the following individuals, groups, and organizations. The list includes 11 elected officials; 21 federal agencies; 22 state and local governments; 7 American Indian Tribes and Nations; 3 libraries, 44 organizations; and approximately 300 individuals.

In addition, the Draft EIS will be available on the internet at <http://www.or.blm.gov/csnm/>.

Elected Officials

Oregon

U.S. Senator Gordon Smith
U. S. Senator Ron Wyden
U.S. Representative Greg Walden
U.S. Representative Peter DeFazio
Commissioner Sue Kupillas
Coos County Commissioners

California

U.S. Senator Barbara Boxer
U. S. Representative Wally Herger
State Senator Maurice Johannessen
State Assemblyman Dick Dickerson
Siskiyou County Supervisor Joan Smith
Siskiyou County Supervisor Kay Bryan

Federal Agencies

U.S. Department of Agriculture - U.S. Forest Service
Klamath National Forest
Applegate Ranger District
Ashland Ranger District

Rogue River National Forest
Goosenest Ranger District

U.S. Department of Energy - Bonneville Power Administration
Portland Office

U.S. Department of Energy - Federal Regulatory Commission
Regional Office in Portland

U.S. Department of Interior - Bureau of Land Management
Redding Field Office
Oregon State Office

Klamath Resource Area
California State Office

U.S. Department of Interior - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Portland Office

Yreka Office

U.S. Department of Interior - Bureau of Reclamation
Portland Office

Boise Office

U.S. Department of Interior - Bureau of Indian Affairs
Portland Office

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Washington Office

Seattle Office Portland Office

U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration
Portland Offices

U.S. Department of Commerce - National Marine Fisheries Service
Portland Office

State and Local Government

Oregon

Oregon Department of Forestry
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife
Southern Oregon University
Oregon State University
University of Oregon
Oregon State Dept. of Transportation
Oregon Dept. of Environmental Quality
Oregon Natural Heritage Program
State Historic Preservation Officer
City of Ashland
Southern Oregon Extension Center
Jackson Co. Farm Bureau
Jackson County Soil and Water Conservation District

California

California Department of Forestry
California Department of Fish & Game
Siskiyou County Administrator
Siskiyou County APCD
Siskiyou County Planning Department
California Air Resources Board
University of California, Davis

Washington

Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission

Florida

University of Florida

Idaho

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality

Washington, DC

National Museum of Natural History

American Indian Tribes and Nations

Confederated Tribes of Siletz
Quartz Valley Indian Reservation (Shasta Tribes)
Shasta Nation
Confederated Bands [Shasta] Shasta Upper Klamath Indians
Confederated Tribes of the Rogue-Table Rock and Associated Tribes
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Klamath Tribes
Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Indians

Libraries

Siskiyou County Library, Yreka Branch
Jackson County Library, Ashland Branch
Southern Oregon University Library, Ashland, Oregon

Businesses and Organizations

Headwaters	US West Communications
Motorcycle Riders Association	AT&T Wireless Services
Blue Ribbon Coalition Inc.	California Oregon Broadcasting, Inc.
Klamath Siskiyou Wildlands Center	ARC-EN-CIEL
Southern Oregon Timber Industry Assoc.	World Wildlife Fund
Pacific Power	Pacific Crest Trail Assoc.
Soda Mt. Wilderness Council	Siskiyou Project
Colestine Rural Fire District	Roxy Ann Gem & Mineral Inc.
Southern Oregon Mountain Bike Association	World Wildlife Fund
Southern Oregon Research Extension Center	PacifiCorp
California Oregon Broadcasting, Inc.	Friends of the Greensprings
Farm Service Agency	Klamath Herald and News
Siskiyou Resource Geographics	NFA
Jackson County Stockman Assoc.	Cold Creek Ranch
Jackson County Farm Bureau	Rogue Valley Audubon Society
Jackson County Soil Water Conservation District	American Lands Alliance
Soda Mountain Wilderness Council	Wildlife Management. Institute
Klamath Alliance for Resources & Environment	Hillcrest Corp
North Umpqua Back Country Horsemen	Oregon Natural Desert Association
New Mexico Cattle Growers Association	KARE
Boise Cascade Corporation	Deixis Consultants
Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Council	US Timberlands

Individuals

Donald Rowlett	Jerry Barry	John Hawksley
Adena Cook	David R. Godard	Peg Stewart
Reuben Rajala	Cate Yocum	Charlie Boyer
Kenneth Gabel	Steve Bridges	Maurine Riggles
David Olson	Ben Benjamin	Steve Johnson
Francee Bounds	Pat Clason	Jean Danielson
Robert Horton	Bryan Baumgartner	Connie Pallman
John Bragg	Faye & Roy D. Ford Sr.	Glen Miller
Anthony Peiffer	Erika Bentsen	Jean Gilmore
Jeff S.	John P. Thornton	Mary Ellen Thompson
Fredric Berger	Raymond Odom	Otis Hussey
Carl Perdue	Stephani Odom	Mike Evans
Vern Crawford	Diane Meyer	Warren Merz
Travis Wright	Dr. Jad D'Allura	Dr. Stephen Cross
Donald Fontenot	Lori J. Cooper	Lou Gold
Jerry W. Dawson	Betty J. Linnell	Rose M. Thorpe
Sandy Shaffer	Jack Sutherland	James R. Brunner
Alan and Majorie Neal	John Dimick	R. Warner
Steven Meeks	Nancy Block	Leon Kincaid
Don Ellsworth	Toni Williams	Rose Marie Davis
Connie Lonsdale	C. Edwards	Dave Dobak
Stacy Tyree	David Tyre	Tom Miller
Adrien Barats	Andy Smith	Harry McCabe
Jerry V. Lehman	Bill Shackelford	Edward J. Johannes
John and Betty Reynolds	Randy White	Delbert Moore
MeredithLyle & Beverly Woodlock		Doug Frawn
Kurt Stark	Nancy Rineman	George S. Duggar
Ross Mickey	W M Hutchinson	James F. Moore, Jr.
M. JoAnn Gilliam	Moe Morrow	Kathleen GanfasBill
Turner	Timber Products	E. & R. Gulbranson
Robert Perlick	Terry Peasley	Bill and Aileen Alves

Marjorie Troutman	Joy Newcom	Gary Schrodtt
Bruce & Leslie Sargent	Jo & Lance Cullumbine	Tony & Karen Pierce
Vickie Aldwin	Charles Young	Larry and Linnea Wardwell
Ken Cummings	Boise Cascade Corp.	Ramona Osburn
George McKinley	Gary Wirth	James and Regina Murdock
Dee Lloyd	Kurt Stark	John W. Menke
Dan Coffman	Bryan Baumgartner	Jerry V. Lehman
Lee Ann Johnson	Diana Burke	Dave Colwell
Ron Schaaf	Lester Wells	Mary Roehrich
David P. Fletcher	Elvin Paul	Mark Salvo
Daniel Gilman	G. Greely Wells, Jr.	Rocky Reeser
Jack Helvie	Jack Merkle	Stan & Elaine Pardee
Elaine Plaisance & Jim Duncan	Romain Cooper	Kim Freeman
Marjorie Hickey	Stanley & Diana Katona	Gerald Froiland
Charles & Jonna Mix	Gerald & Grace Green	Richard Colvard
Stan Lisky	Marilyn & Craig Miller	Scott Saulsbury
Martin Lugus	James Hines	John and Kathy Gorham
Don Ellsworth	Jon Elliott	Bill Rooker
Terry Hamrich	James DePree	David Lemos
Mary Lea Lemos	Pamela Carpenter	Jeanne Dillman
Michelle Hanson	Merle Hanson	Karen Salley
Stephen Auerbach	Judson Parsons	Beverly Hurd
Ms. Julie Hightower	Penny Meads	Nancy J. Ingalsbee
Jim and Barbara Long	Mike Read	Ronald Love
Tony Steenkolk	Christina Lehman	Emily Savage
Edward & Jeannette Lemos	Mary Thornton	Terry S. Lehman
Deanne Ragnell	Susan Kendle	Tom Marr
Daniel and Jenelyn Wessler	Dr. Dominic Della Sala	Mr & Mrs. Peters
Evelyn Hass	Ron Pio	Don Kemry
James Miller	Elizabeth Bailey	Robert E. Miller Jr.
D. Conradi	Jack and Linda Cook	Richard J. Gordon
J L Zedkier	Barbara Newell	Goldie Miller
Norman E. Fiock	Rick Evans	Dr. Terry Frest
David Lexow & Carma Kemry	John and Anita Ward	Karen Coulter
Pamela Borich	Mike Ichisaka	Carlton, Allen
A. and C. Herskind	Ron Sutphin	Mike Ichisaka
Bob Lofgren	Richard Taylor	Ed Syrjala
Jerry Clayton	Marcia Suter	Bart Kent
Chester and Nadine Smith	Sherman A. Meeds	John Britton
Susan Menanno	Suzi & Bob Given	P. E. Blatt
Mr. John Alexander	Frank and Janice Zern	Eric Stone
Ilona Toko	Patrice Ward	Lisa K. Hass
Bill Drewin	Mark Weber	Evan Frost
Tom Phillips	Peter & Jenny Clark	S. C. & Rhoda B. Abrahams
Karen Little	Paula Miller	James Skillen
Eric Kresh	Laurel Reuben	M. Hickey
Murrel Wigington	Bob Davison	Bob Fletcher
Horace Bowers	Gillian Lyons	Linda Neale
Anthony Minatoli	Jim Impara	Jerry Randazzo
Carl & Wanda Perdue	Wesley & Mary Creteny	Gary Hanson
Pam Marsh	Don Straw	Laura Rahm
D. McGuire	Terri Ayers	Daniel B. Marsh
Dr. Paul Frey	Rhonda Stebbins	

LIST OF PREPARERS

Karen Bolda, Fisheries Biologist: M.S., Animal Behavior, San Diego State University, San Diego CA; B.S., Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, IL.; 7 years experience working as a natural resource specialist at various state, federal, and private agencies, 3 years working as a fish biologist for BLM

Matt Broyles, Wildlife Biologist: B.S., Wildlife Management, Humboldt State University; Graduate Study, Southern Oregon State University; 11 years BLM.

Greg Chandler, Fuels Specialist: B.S./M.S. Forestry, Southern Illinois University; 21 years BLM.

Brad Cownover, Landscape Architect: B.A., Visual Arts, Baylor University; Graduate study in Landscape Architecture, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign; 3 years USFS; 2 years BLM

Cindy Donegan, Writer/Editor Assistance: Student, Southern Oregon State University; 12 years intermittent BLM

Ted Hass, Soil Scientist/Planning and Environmental Coordinator: B.S., Soil Science, California Polytechnic University, Pomona; 2 years Soil Conservation Service; 21 years BLM

Joseph Hoppe, Reality Specialist: B.A., Geography, University of Montana; B.S., Forestry, Oregon State University; 23 years BLM

Dr. Paul Hosten, Ecologist: Ph.D, Utah State University; M.S., University of Natal; B.S.(hons), Rhodes University, South Africa; B.S., University of Port Elizabeth, South Africa; 3 years associated with BLM through contracting.

Howard Hunter, Management Coordination: B.S., Forest Management, Humboldt State University; 23 years BLM.

Laurie Lindell, Hydrologist: M.S., Hydrology and Water Resources, Colorado State University; 21 years BLM.

Lorie List, Interpretive Specialist: M.S., Environmental Education, Southern Oregon University; 1 year BLM.

Kenny McDaniel, Forester: B.S., Forest Management, Utah State University; Graduate study, Oregon State University and University of Washington; 22 years BLM, 2 years USFS.

Jan Miller, Realty Specialist: B.S., Forestry Management, University of Minnesota; 33 years BLM.

Mark Mousseaux, Botanist: M.S., Forest Science, University of Idaho; 16 years USFS, 1 year BLM.

Jeannine Rossa, Fisheries Biologist: M.S., Aquatic Ecology, Utah State University; B.S. Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, University of California, Davis. 9 years fisheries and aquatic biologist for private, state and other federal organizations; 9 years BLM.

Dave Russell, Silviculturist: B.S., Forestry and M.S., Forest Pathology, Michigan State University. 20 years BLM.

John Samuelson, Forest Engineer: B.S., Forest Management, University of Minnesota; Graduate Study, Oregon State University; 23 years BLM.

Thomas Sensenig, Ecologist: Graduate study, Forest Ecology, Oregon State University; M.S., Silviculture, University of Washington: B.S., Forestry, West Virginia University; 20 years BLM.

Jennifer Smith, Fisheries Biologist: B.S., Biology, University of Oregon; Graduate Study, Southern Oregon University; 10 years as fisheries and riparian biologist working for various federal, state, and private agencies.

Fred Tomlins, Recreation Planner: M.S., Wildland Recreation Management, University of Idaho; B.S., Business Administration, University of California, Berkeley; 22 years BLM.

Tim Westfall, Rangeland Management Specialist: M.S., Rangeland Ecology and Management, University of Idaho; B.S., Range Resources / Wildlife Resources, University of Idaho; 23 years range ecology and management, habitat ecology, and riparian ecology for private, state and federal agencies.

Larry Zowada, Geographic Information Specialist: B.S., Forestry Resource Management, University of Idaho; 3 years Forest Service, 23 years BLM

The Planning Team would like to acknowledge the contributions of the University of Idaho. Dr. Bill McClaughlin, Dr. Steve Hollenhorst, David Morgan and Ryan Moore provided current social and economic information.

The Planning Team would like to thank the following people for their assistance in preparing this Draft Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement:

Dave Squyres
Eric Runquist
Dr. Frank A. Lang
Ann Ramage
Dr. Kate Winthrop
Diane Parry

Judy Briney
Kathy Harris
James Langhoff
Jim Rounds
Bill Haight
Bill Yocum

Ken Brown
Robyn Hertz
Cliff McClelland
Eric Stone
Kevin Priester
Mike Hamel